



ADDRESS TO STUDENTS. Delivered by the President, Mr. WILLIAM EMERSON,
at the Seventh General Meeting, Monday, 5th February 1900.

IT is now my official and, I may add, also my pleasing duty to say a few words to our students, the younger members of the profession. In doing so I think it would not greatly advantage you were I to enter into the details of an architect's work in relation to the many subjects on which he may be called upon to exercise his talents, or were I to enlarge on my own experience in life and endeavour to explain for your benefit such things as, for instance, the points that should enter into your consideration when preparing plans and designs for an ordinary town or country house, though this is most likely one of the first subjects that many of you may be employed upon.

Nor do I propose to set forth my views as to what principles should be adopted in arranging a cathedral or church to meet modern congregational requirements, or what period or style should be your "point de départ" in preparing such a design, though this also is a problem which many who are ambitious will possibly early start upon solving. Neither do I think it would do any particular good to state on what lines I may think you should proceed in entering upon a competition, say, for a monumental structure, of the town-hall or other public building type, which, nevertheless, is an effort that many of you will doubtless shortly make.

Any one of such subjects would form good material for an exhaustive paper, but all are details of the knowledge an architect should have, and may, or indeed must be, studied and thought out by the enquiring and perceptive mind of the student who is hoping to succeed in his profession. Besides I have no doubt you will hear from Mr. Bodley many wise suggestions as to principles of planning and designing in the course of his critical remarks on the drawings submitted for the medals and prizes. What I therefore think of doing is rather to direct your attention to several essentials that lie at the root of the matter in the practice of architecture, if success and noble work be aimed at—almost first principles rather than details. I hope the few points I shall touch on may be found of some practical use, and perhaps elevate your thoughts in regard to the importance of, and the responsibilities attached to, your art and profession, and also perhaps be incentives to prosecute with vigour the necessary studies in the line of life you have selected.

The practice of architecture, I need scarcely add, is one of the most toilsome and difficult, as well as one of the most noble, worthy, and interesting of all secular pursuits, and one in which the life and history of a people should be indicated more than in any other.

To enter upon it is therefore a very serious step for a young man to take. Architecture is not solely a fine art, nor is it altogether simply a profession.

It has two distinct sides. The one is the artistic side, the other the practical and business side, and each is as essential to the other as the stomach to the head. I allude to this because one cannot help feeling that some of us appear to fancy that the sum total of architecture is comprised in the facile preparation of drawings that shall show well on paper. The design may be architecturally good, and artistically and correctly drawn; or it may be not good, and trickily and untruthfully drawn; and also we appear to lose sight of the effect of materials and detail, and of the important fact that the practice of modern architecture includes, besides the artistic element (without which it can only be termed building), the necessity for a knowledge of a vast series of practical subjects. For instance, without a certain amount of legal knowledge an architect cannot safely advise his employers regarding contracts with builders, or in respect to the purchase of or dealing with building sites. He should understand the respective legal rights of tenants and owners of property, and the laws as to rights of light and air, and adjoining owners. He should be acquainted with the sanitary and protective enactments for buildings erected under the laws of the Local Government Board, and factory and other Acts, and under school regulations; also with the legal points in respect to the rights of the parishioners and clergy in ecclesiastical edifices: neither can he ignore such legislation as the Workmen's Compensation Act, which has had to be taken into account by our Council in dealing with the form of contract between employers and builders; and he must understand the legal side of the County Council's Building Acts—if he ever can fathom it.

I do not mean to suggest that an architect should be so complete a lawyer as to be competent to advise his employers on any intricate legal question arising through building operations—that would be neither advisable nor safe—but I do mean that he should have such an acquaintance with these matters as to recognise the obligation of attention to points in his schemes, plans, and advice to his employers affected thereby; otherwise his ignorance or neglect may involve his employers, who should be his best friends, in serious difficulties and pecuniary loss. In the course of an architect's varied practice many of these questions are sure to crop up, and woe betide him if he has disregarded them, though to know them all may be the work of a lifetime.

There must also be a knowledge of the latest scientific inventions affecting buildings; of construction in all its details; materials, accounts, and the values of materials and labour.

But apart from all the practical matters, and to turn to the artistic side, a wide appreciation of the beautiful in all styles of architecture is necessary for the enlargement of the views, and to open the eyes as to what architecture in its highest aspirations really means.

My old friend and master, the late Mr. William Burges, used to point out to his pupils the necessity of knowing how to learn—the time saved by a knowledge of what was best to study—and he emphatically declaimed against the waste of time involved in making many pretty sketches rather than a few careful measured drawings of good examples.

A pretty sketch may show a certain effect; but, without dissection of the building sketched, how that effect is obtained can no more be understood than the working of the human frame without the study of anatomy. Burges also had a maxim, that in art the thing that looks well is well. There is manifestly great truth in this. The false, either in architecture, painting, sculpture, music, or literature, neither looks well, sounds well, nor reads well. And this is discernible to the cultivated eye and ear in regard to these, in the same measure that the false ring about a double-minded person is instinctively perceptible to the honest and truthful soul. All these points suggested infinite food for reflection to us, and it could not do students any harm to consider them now.

The practice of architecture *should not mean* to those adopting it just a method of gaining a livelihood, and consequently the obtaining of clients as the first consideration (no matter by what way), and the giving the least possible value in the shape of brain work with smallest trouble in return for their remuneration. Were this the idea bad builders might be evolved, but never good architects.

It *should mean* the putting of selfish ends on one side for the sake of the art, with a determination that no personal considerations shall weigh in the balance, providing in the best manner for our employer's wants at any amount of self-sacrifice, and building for them in truth and beauty, to the utmost that may be in the capacity of the architect. If you do not quite grasp the full meaning of this you cannot do better than study the works of our late Honorary Fellow Mr. John Ruskin, whose death we are lamenting; and more particularly his *Seven Lamps of Architecture*, which include the Lamp of Truth. All that he says need not necessarily be taken for granted, but all is worthy of the deepest reflection.

Further, it should also mean, building not just for the present, but for the future, works that may last, and of such a class that future generations may form a high, and not a low, opinion of what we are as a nation. To arrive at this altruistic level of work means an exalted feeling of the value to others of beautiful architecture, and the worth to the world of honest hard work.

There are several things most necessary for the student who has such high aims. First, there must be diligent study. Secondly, there must be the power of drawing. Thirdly, there must be enthusiasm. And with all these there must be combined a high ideal of the responsibilities of the architect. Then, granted that you possess all these gifts, if you have not the *spirit* of architecture, you had much better leave it entirely alone; for if under the circumstances architecture paid you, you would derive no sort of satisfaction from it but the monetary one, and that can be obtained with less exhaustive labour in inferior occupations.

But with regard to study, and how and what to study—and I am alluding now to the art side of architecture, not to the practical—in the latter the courses of study necessary for passing in the subjects of our Examinations are known to you all. They form the foundation on which your art must be erected, and without such practical knowledge the art side is well-nigh useless. But besides these practical courses of study, all the subjects which a cultivated gentleman should have an acquaintance with, including the classics, ancient and modern history and literature, are equally necessary to educate the taste, to assist the imagination, and properly to comprehend the evolution of architecture. That all these are needed is clear when you reflect that all that can be constructed, from large architectural or engineering structures down to goldsmith's work and embroidery, legitimately comes within the province of the architect. All engineering works, bridges or otherwise, are the better for the architectural element being combined with them, and all architecture comprises some amount of engineering; neither can afford to ignore the other. Also embroidery necessitates knowledge of form and design. This, then, means a vast range of study for the student. But with regard to the study of architecture proper, it is well to begin by carefully examining any one style that attracts you, and to study it thoroughly from its commencement to its end—if you can find either. In reality you will discover, if you have any real zest in the work, that to find any beginning or any end you will be forced into the comparative analysis of all styles. If you do not consider Greek work you will not understand Roman; if you ignore Roman, half the meaning of Romanesque and Byzantine will be an enigma to you. Unless you have studied all these thoughtfully you will really know but little. For instance, you would not understand how such a thing came about (though of no great importance) that the classic entablature should have developed—or shall I say, have been compressed?—into the

Gothic abacus; also without comparing Mahomedan work with Gothic many of the possibilities of the pointed arch would be unappreciated; and if the differences in the treatments of the Oriental and Classic or Italian domes have not been considered, you will miss seeing the potentialities of the dome or what might be done with it if you ever have the chance. And the origin of hybrid or deduced examples of architecture can only be understood by a knowledge of the purer styles from which they are departures.

Therefore study all styles of architecture, and without prejudice. On one occasion some years ago I had been showing a younger architect some photographs of magnificent work in India; he looked at them listlessly and then said, "Well, of course we cannot feel any interest in Indian things after having seen the glorious Early French architecture in Normandy."

If a mind is so cramped as that, and there is the latent idea that all perfection of architecture may be found either in a Greek, Early French, fourteenth-century English, Jacobean, or a bastard Queen Anne, Georgian, or any other style, there would seem no redemption for so small a soul, unless perchance a change to thoughtful study and intelligent travel might compass it.

There is nothing more contracting to the individual's mind than existence in a small circle, and nothing more cramps perception than imagining perfection to exist in one direction only.

Therefore the best of the various styles and their purest examples should be the subjects of the first most careful study, reflection, and comparison by the student. The finest works in architecture are those which have perfectly suited the circumstances of the age and nation for which they were erected, were well and honestly constructed, stately and beautiful in proportion and detail, and truthful in the expressions of their purpose. And the best examples are those which are the purest, whether in Greek, Roman, Gothic, Renaissance, or any other period. In examining hybrid or deduced styles much of picturesqueness and interest is frequently found, but there is generally a something lacking of the greater elements of the finest architecture, either in simplicity and breadth, monumental grandeur, or truth, which jars on the most cultivated and refined taste. In this, however, architecture only expresses something of humanity; the perfectly pure human would be somewhat above this world: so with our mundane needs, the absolute purist in architecture would find he could not altogether comply with modern requirements. Nevertheless I reiterate that the purest examples of architecture are the most worthy of careful drawing and measuring by the student. Occasional eccentricities of detail sometimes perhaps, when even a trifle bizarre, lend now and again interest to the general harmony of a design, as a discordant note may give point to a passage in music; they are incidents which may be interesting and quite worthy of sketching, but as details or points of accentuation only, not as precedents with a view to give a general character or eccentricity to a design. I note this point because of late years debased or eccentric detail seems to have pleased the taste of the public, as well as that of architects, and appears to pass for style. It should be remembered that it is infinitely more difficult to design thoughtfully and effectively with simplicity and breadth of treatment than to endeavour to hide artistic incapacity by an elaborate clothing of ill-adapted ornament, or by an affectation of originality of thought, or eccentricity of form, to attract the attention of an unthinking crowd. So the first suggestion I make to you is, study most the best and purest examples of all styles of architecture.

Some time ago the one thing most prominently urged upon students of architecture was the paramount necessity for draughtsmanship—drawing first, drawing second, and drawing last. This resulted in much good, and draughtsmanship has now been brought by many of you to a high pitch of excellence; but also, I think, some harm has resulted. Too great value seems

occasionally attached to the effect, technique, and execution of the drawing itself; and the quality of the architecture, a far greater thing, is sometimes apparently considered of secondary importance. This is entirely wrong. The effect of architecture certainly cannot be shown without good drawing, but draughtsmanship, however excellent, cannot make inferior architecture good. William Burges used to say there was only one man in whose architectural perspectives he could really understand the details, and that man was Axel Hermann Haig. Of late, however, many of our younger architects have done splendid work. Nevertheless occasionally, on looking at the numerous clever sketches made, something of the same feeling strikes me even now.

A good general effect of *chiaroscuro* is given; little touches of shadow are put in effectively, and impossible high lights and unnatural broken lines are introduced, mainly with a view to make a picturesque and pretty drawing, and not truthfully to represent the design. It thus becomes inferior artist's work, and does not represent the architecture. Often not much more detail can be made out than, perhaps, that it is Renaissance or Gothic in character, and that the windows have square or arched heads, either circular or pointed in shape.

But on examining one of Mr. Haig's drawings, say of Chartres Cathedral, there are also grand and picturesque and pictorial effects of *chiaroscuro*, but the high lights and shadows are true. Details are shown by clearly defined drawing, and mouldings are so accurately suggested as to be almost as plainly read as in a working drawing, whilst the statues are absolute portraits. As architecture is largely composed of details, if a drawing slurs them over, and is indefinite, its vitality in a great measure is lost, and its utility sacrificed, if intended for an architectural drawing; and it becomes merely a picturesque sketch, of value simply in relation to its artistic quality and technique as such, not as a study of architecture.

The French understand this, and therefore their drawings of architecture are much more academic than ours.

I think our style of drawing is defective in many ways. French drawings give by clean lines and properly cast shadows a fairly truthful impression of the detail, relief, and projection of a building. By our method shadows are sketched in merely with a view to look pleasing on paper, and frequently convey a false effect of the cornices and other salient features.

Some years ago designs were mainly shown by coloured perspectives; then it was said they were so "faked up" by the artists that they were quite untrue representations of the designs. Consequently pen-and-ink drawings became the fashion. Messrs. Street and Shaw were the first and most conspicuous representatives of this style, and coloured architectural perspectives have practically disappeared.

But I would ask what can be more untruthful and misleading than a black-and-white line drawing of a building constructed of several differently coloured materials? A monotone design, no doubt, can be well shown this way, but is it not evident how misleading an etched drawing may be in representing, for instance, a design in red bricks and white stone? In the black and white it may look charming, yet when erected prove a most restless composition, owing to the spots, blotches, and streaks of white stone sprinkled all over its surface. Now this effect in a tinted elevation or coloured perspective would at once be apparent; in the black and white it is unnoticed, and when the building is erected it possibly disappoints the owner and the architect also.

No doubt the reproduction by the journals has much to do with this matter. Colour does not easily photograph, whereas black and white comes out most satisfactorily.

Pretty sketching is very seductive and of infinite use, but it sometimes leads to a distaste

for the labour of making careful measured drawings—truly a tedious business, but without which no really useful knowledge of how details cause effects can be obtained.

My second word to you this evening is, therefore, learn to draw accurately and definitely, as many of you already do excellently well, but do not neglect to supplement it by careful dissection and measurements. Also study the human figure, for more than all else that instils a fine sense of proportion. But, above all, do not let sketching run away with you, or mistake drawing for architecture: it is not; but simply a means to an end, and bears the same relation to it that an alphabet bears to a language.

The third essential I would put before you as imperative to the successful accomplishment of noble architecture is an unlimited enthusiasm. If your work is to be worth anything at all there must be such an enthusiastic love for it that self and selfish considerations sink altogether into the background. Enthusiasm, derived from the Greek *ἐνθουσιασμός*, signifies "a God-inspiring zeal." If you look towards the sun your own shadow is unseen, being cast behind you; so if your mind's aspirations are steadfast towards a lofty ideal, through your entire possession by this God-inspiring zealousness there will be complete unconsciousness of self in respect to your art.

And this is most important, for then the inspired desire will be simply to do the most perfect work according to your light, for the sake of Art alone; other considerations will be only incidental to it, and eccentricities with the view of attracting attention to yourself, or of notoriety, will find no place in your designs, and your work will live.

This inspiration is manifest in the best and purest of all old examples of architecture, and proved by the history of the lives of some of the architects. For instance, how great must have been the zeal of Michael Angelo to urge him on with his work amidst intrigues, jealousies, pecuniary difficulties, and family worries and disappointments.

If it were needful for the attainment of noble work in the simpler olden times, how very much more must it be indispensable to carry a modern architect through the arduous labour necessary for the production of one of the complicated buildings of the present time, with its manifold requirements, and to sustain a young man through the toil at high pressure, the anxieties of business, and the many certain and vexatious disappointments which meet every architect in these dreadful days of competition, and indeed most other persons on their way through life, whatever that way may be.

Further, it is all very well to fancy, as some appear to do, that Architecture as a fine art is altogether apart from, and above, the sphere of such practical matters as drainage, heating and ventilating, electricity, hydraulic power, gas and water supplies, and such like. Granted that it is on a higher level, nevertheless there is no important edifice, public or private, erected now to which these things are not vital; it has been well said they are the very nerves of the structure. If any building is to properly answer to its requirements it must be not only artistic, but also scientific.

These scientific details require consideration by the architect from the very commencement of the inception of his scheme. Their introduction affects not only the plan but the design, and even details; and the ignoring of them or leaving them entirely to specialists to fit in as best they can in an imperfectly thought-out arrangement increases the cost, often spoils the building, causes inefficiency in future working, and vexes and irritates the employer.

But to grasp all these necessary and important details implies the thoughtful use of every talent with which you have been endowed, and an infinite capacity for taking pains; and in neglecting these things for the absorbing interest of the art side of the profession the architect, as well as any other person who does not use necessary foresight in all details of

his profession, no matter what his business may be, is not doing his duty either to God or his neighbour or his country.

Because these things are surrounded by practical difficulties, are troublesome and not particularly interesting, to lose heart or interest in the work, and let them take their chance, is an easy but downward course. The architect who does so is lacking in a sense of responsibility; but on such a sure and certain Nemesis waits. Let noble architecture be your first consideration, but practical use should follow closely in its wake. It is enthusiasm which alone will ensure the architect's retaining the love of his art and a lofty ideal amidst these practical difficulties and immense responsibilities inseparable from his profession, and that will enable him to do his duty not only by his employer but by the nation. Therefore I say, foster enthusiasm and guard its door, for from it are the issues of the life of your art. An architect is not acting squarely by his country if he puts up hideous eyesores, or insanitary or inconvenient buildings. It should never be forgotten that, if our buildings last, on the architects almost more than on any other workers will depend what verdict may be passed in the future on the character, artistic taste, culture, intellect, and nobility of the British Empire of the time—whether we shall be reckoned by posterity as having been one of the greatest nations the world has seen, or as a small-minded, sordid, uncultured, and superficial race. For these are exemplified by our architecture.

But one can only endeavour to act honestly and zealously according to one's capacities; everyone is not gifted with the highest talents, nor can all expect to be Michael Angelos or Giulio Romanos. Therefore never let failure damp your ardour; it is the best general who makes the fewest mistakes, but all must make them at times, so be not disheartened by errors or inexperience; only let them spur you on to further and nobler effort.

The true architect must ever aim at the highest ideal if his work is to live, and with the greater knowledge and means of learning in this enlightened age it is possibly within the power of some gifted ones to attain approximately in some instances to their ideal. Be careful, therefore, what your ideal is. It should ever be beyond your best efforts. As Browning says—

A man's reach should exceed his grasp,
Or what's a Heaven for?

As architects the uttermost powers you possess should be exerted for your art; they are not given to do what you like with, but to use for the benefit of others, in everything however small, and even though the work be not what you may consider sufficiently interesting to call for the highest endeavour. You cannot be waiting always for a great opportunity to exert yourselves. I came across the following words the other day, which I will leave with you as worthy of thought, for without some such sense of moral responsibility as is implied in them your work in life as architects or men will be deficient in quality: "Our task in this life is to employ to the uttermost that human faculty, that human talent which has been given to us, and not to let it wait for some exceptional moment in which we shall probably never find ourselves, or we may die without ever knowing or dreaming what lies in the capacity of everyone of us to be, to dare, or to do."

REVIEW OF WORKS SUBMITTED FOR PRIZES AND STUDENTSHIPS 1900,

WITH WHICH IS INCORPORATED A PAPER READ BEFORE STUDENTS OF THE ROYAL ACADEMY IN 1885

ON SOME PRINCIPLES AND CHARACTERISTICS OF ANCIENT ARCHITECTURE, AND THEIR APPLICATION TO THE MODERN PRACTICE OF THE ART.

By G. F. BODLEY [*F.*], A.R.A., F.S.A., *Royal Gold Medallist* 1899.

MR. PRESIDENT AND GENTLEMEN,—

I HOPE I shall be pardoned if I do not to-night dwell at much length on particular designs, or on particular drawings that were exhibited in the neighbouring rooms.

It seems to me that what little time we have to-night will be best spent if I offer you some few remarks on the general principles that appear to have guided architects in the great days of our art. For these remarks will be addressed to the students of this our Institute. Not, however, but that we are, or ought to be, all learners, as has often been said.

First let me say to you, students, whose work has been recently seen by us, and I hope visited by many, that I was scarcely prepared for the treat I had in looking through your various and beautiful delineations of ancient work—work that brought back many pleasant old days before one—days of one's travels in Italy and other Continental countries, and lastly, but not the least enjoyable, in Old England, with her beautiful and noble churches and her many delightful and stately old houses.

What days of enthusiastic and profitable enjoyment were brought back to one by the remembrance of the times that one spent in the presence of architectural works that commanded one's utter respect and admiration—days spent in solitary meditation, or in company with old friends, now passed away, while the enduring works remain. Well, students, we must pass on to the mention of some of the exhibits that your year's work has given to us—though I shall do so rapidly and slightly, the rather to pass on and offer some remarks on the principles that I think should animate our designs.

Let me take the drawings sent in for the Owen Jones Studentship first. Five were submitted. The prize has been won by Mr. Geo. A. Paterson, and medals of merit given to Messrs. J. B. Fulton and J. Hervey Rutherford. Besides these Mr. Cummings and Mr. Greenslade sent specimens of their work, which I admired. They are careful drawings of well-selected specimens—some, no doubt, of finer quality than others, but all of them instructive for decorative work of this kind. Now, this Owen Jones prize is an important and useful one. I am glad that so many of you went in for it; more, I believe, than in other years. The whole art of colour is a most interesting one. Think how Nature teaches it everywhere. The pale blue sky and the fuller tint of the far blue hills—the thousand tints of green of the grass, and the trees and the foreground, jewelled with flowers, as if with sapphires and pearls. In all the great days of our art colour played an important part. The Greeks stained their white marble and touched it with azure and gold. Mediæval work, as we have seen in the many examples you have given us, was full of colour. Colour is, indeed, one of the fairest of the handmaids of architecture. To recur to Nature, have you ever observed how she contends with ugly colour, subdues it, for it always conquers, and sets it right? It is a standing miracle!

Naturally many of these drawings are copies of the painting that remains on Norfolk and Suffolk wood work, on the screens and the roofs there. For there was a great school of decorative painting in that part of England. It was derived in great measure from Flemish

work. Now, in these eastern counties there seems to have been two schools of painters—the one quite English and the other deriving its inspiration from Flanders. The latter came from the land that produced Memling and Van Eyck. Sometimes, no doubt, crude in drawing, and without much beauty in the faces, this great Flemish school was delightful in colour—richer, indeed, in that respect than Italian work with all its refinement and grace of expression. Such old work is rapidly fading away and perishing, and much has been ruthlessly destroyed. I hope that such drawings as you have given us may save something of the beauty of old work as examples for us. All architectural students should study colour, and learn its harmonies, as you would those of music. Though all of us may not have a sensitive eye for colour, yet a good deal may be learnt.

As architects you should know the tints of all the marbles that can be got nowadays, and learn to arrange them in shafts and friezes and pavements, harmoniously or in agreeable contrast. It should be all done with breadth of effect, for that is essential for such work.

Next I would speak of the drawings submitted for the Pugin Studentship.

Naturally Gothic architecture of our own country has been selected for delineation. Mr. James M'Lachlan has the first prize; Mr. E. W. Turner and Mr. J. A. Woore take Medals of Merit. Mr. M'Lachlan's drawings are excellent. His drawing of the vaulting of the choir at Christ Church, Oxford, is most able, and that also of the Shrine of Edward II. Mr. E. W. Turner's drawings of Peterborough Cathedral are very painstaking and good. Mr. Forbes, Mr. Raine, and Mr. Pearson have done well. I do not think it is of much or any use criticising drawings—as such. No doubt some surpass others in draughtsmanship, and some select their subjects more wisely than others. But the very merits of the old work seem to withdraw criticism and to silence the critic. This is not a drawing-school. It is one for the study of architecture in all its many phases. And here one word as to drawing—I must remind you that, useful and interesting as is that art, it is not design. They drew but poorly in days when they built magnificently. As architects, when you have to design, you must set your heart on your building, not on your drawing.

Your building is to be for all time—your drawing but the thing of a day. And here let me advise you, when you get your first opportunity of designing a building, to shut your eyes, and, with your mind's eye, call up the vision of the edifice as entire and as complete as it will stand. Not only the mass but every detail must be there visible—perfectly visible to your mental vision. Then, with eager hand, careless of how your drawing looks, put your perception on paper part by part and detail by detail. You will know instinctively what each moulding should be, what each capital. You have *seen* the building; it has stamped itself upon your imagination. Here and there you may suppress an idea or control a thought, finding it is not wanted, or, if used, it may jar with the conception of your mind.

But this seeing the whole building, complete and entire, is what you *must* do. Of course you will have had to acquaint yourself before this with all the requirements and the possibilities—the site, the surroundings, and the materials you have to use.

Then, having informed yourself on these necessary details, it is for you to create that vision that I have spoken of—that building in which every single detail, as well as its proportion, its colour, its feeling, has been present with you. The man who can thus conjure up his vision and make it his own is the powerful architect.

Yes! But what if that power is not controlled by principles of beauty—of a harmony with Nature—of breadth and unity of effect—of dignity and of truth? There are architects among us who have a power of the kind I mean. It cannot be denied. They stamp a

character, an animus on all they do. It is evidently *their* work. But, alas! alas! is that character one of beauty, of refinement? Is it consonant with the suavity of Nature? Are there restraint and reserve? I fear in many cases there are few, perhaps none of these qualities, but only that of a vulgar display and unmannerly strength. The opportunity is lost, and another building added to the many that we would rather be without. There has been no restraint, no refinement. Now this reserve is a great quality, but it has its dangers too. With this restraint do not neglect beauty. Do not belong to that school the members of which almost seem to worship the ugly. Put aside all vulgar display, but imbue your building to your utmost with refined beauty and restrained power. Little and infrequent touches of beauty, if they must be few, grafted, as it were, on to a well-proportioned fabric, will give a building a tender grace, and it will be a delight to all passers-by. Be not afraid of beauty and richness when you can get it. Did the civilised ancients worship the ugly? Uncivilised barbarians may have done so; but it is not for Christians, whose Master said "Consider the lilies of the field" in their arrayed beauty, to be worshippers of the ugly. Pardon me for dwelling thus long on this point. I think there is a real danger. For some seem to mistake sterility for simplicity, and gracelessness for grandeur. Let your manner be as graceful as your expression is sincere. When you have the opportunity, imbue your building with a poetry of its own. That can be done even in the simplest work. In great ones you can endow them with a poetry that may be Miltonic. How delightful is the expression alike of the simplest old stone-mullioned and stone-roofed house and the stately Elizabethan mansion!

With regard to the designs for the Tite Certificate, I am disposed to be more critical than I have been. There we have a somewhat unusual idea, for towers are not usually isolated. But let that pass. I fear I miss in most of these designs that indescribable charm, that picturesque feeling that one sees in so much old work. I had not time, however, to examine them very carefully. I am rather doubtful about the effect of most of them, if they should ever be carried out. They struck me as wanting more idea and greater consideration, and more freedom of design. The design marked "Sphinx" has a good idea in its sort of embryo pilasters at the corners, somewhat original, I think, and I can conceive their giving a suggestion of a refined concave shape to the tower that would be pleasing. Mr. Percy Nobbs's sombre perspective does not do justice to his design, which looks better on his elevation. It no doubt has merit.

I was a good deal interested in the design for a Spiral Staircase. Mr. C. E. Varndell's design is able and carefully delineated, and I was pleased with the late Gothic design bearing the motto "Tiny," and consider it good.

In the Measured Drawings I am glad that Mr. James B. Fulton's drawings of St. John's College, Oxford, are awarded the Silver Medal. They are very good drawings of a most interesting place. The garden front, built, I believe, by Archbishop Laud, has a wonderful repose, thoroughly collegiate in character. Mr. H. Inigo Triggs's drawings of Raynham Hall are good. It is very instructive to a young man thus to carefully study, measure, and delineate a whole house that has, like this one, character and interest. It would be a good example to follow in other years. Old houses get so altered, and are so frequently burnt down, that it is a satisfaction to see them drawn out to scale.

The Soane Medallion.—Here I must repeat something of what I have said in regard to the Tite Prize. I cannot but feel that something better might have been done. Mr. Power's drawings are very good. I should criticise the outline of his dome. I thought the design by "Pomegranate" was broad and simple in its treatment, and would be effective if built. I suppose the competitors were rather tied as to style.

In conclusion let me make a few more remarks on the principles and characteristics of architectural design, those that are common to all styles of architecture.

[Mr. Bodley here read some extracts from a Paper read before the students of the Royal Academy in 1885, which has not been hitherto published, and which, with his kind consent, is printed here *in extenso*.]

ON SOME PRINCIPLES AND CHARACTERISTICS OF ANCIENT ARCHITECTURE, AND THEIR APPLICATION TO THE MODERN PRACTICE OF THE ART.

I am to speak to you of some principles and characteristics of architectural design which may, I think, be usefully brought before you for your consideration. My remarks will be but suggestive, and will embody ideas which you may work out for yourselves, at greater length, in your researches into the nature and the history of ancient architecture. They will be, for the most part, principles and characteristics common to all styles, rather than those peculiar to any.

It is no insignificant subject that I would bring before you. Think of the long story of the great works of architecture in the past. What a history it is! Not to look further back, let us think of that marvellous time when Greece, as it were, brought order out of the chaos of barbaric work, and, suddenly, became the land of all that was beautiful in art—art with its sculpture portraying nature, and expressing the life of nature, not only in its highest phase, the portraiture of ideal perfection of the human form, but also in the delicate beauty of carved ornament and artistic detail. Then on to the work of the Romans, massive and sturdy, lacking, indeed, the grace and tenderness of the best Greek work, but eminently impressive and manly, and superior to that of the Greeks in construction, inasmuch as the round arch was a more noble thing than a straight beam of stone.

Then, the darkness before the dawn—through the many gloomy centuries of barbaric work; and then, to look only at our own land, the gradually refining and enriching work of the Norman; the effect of the creation of Gothic, and the revolution that its pointed arch brought about—the almost Greek-like work of the thirteenth century, full of religious feeling, hardly, indeed, seen at its best in England, for it was more advanced and noble in other countries—nevertheless, replete with growing beauty and interest amongst us. Then the great time of the fourteenth century; when, for refinement of design and beauty of detail, our English architecture was second to that of no other country.

Then the fifteenth-century work, the very flower of the Gothic manner, with its development of the kindred arts of painting, of sculpture, stained glass, embroidery and textile fabrics, works all partaking of architectural character.

And then the Renaissance, with its great artistic skill and exuberant richness, with almost lawless beauty, with some lack of restraint and a certain impatience of authority.

We may well review the varied images which such a vision calls up.

I shall not weary you by reciting any long list of examples of the great works of the great past, or by pointing out their merits—you should know them well—but rather speak of some principles of the art that may lead us to see the shortcomings of our modern works, for their possible improvement. For we are not here to recount the great works of the past in our art, but rather to try and learn some lessons to be derived from the principles such examples afford. Before doing so let us, briefly, look at the building of the present day. There is little we can call architecture.

Where in our works, I would ask, are the architectural influences that would tend to educate the people?

Look at any of our new towns where there is not the presence of old buildings to redeem the general aspect of ugliness and vulgarity. It is not that the houses are merely destitute of ornament; there is the presence of vulgar and ugly ornament, so-called, in plenty, sometimes, indeed, in heavy and tiresome profusion.

The shapes and proportions of the houses seem to have come by chance and without design. The ugliest materials have been used, bricks of the poorest colour and of ungainly size, the roofs covered with cold-looking blue slates, and of too large dimensions. The details of the exterior, throughout, without interest, delicacy, or refinement.

But I have sketched enough of the outside of the kind of house which it is a positive pain to enter, so far as one's artistic perceptions are concerned. Inside we find the same poverty or vulgarity of design everywhere. The meanness of stained deal seems to have been delighted in; or, if it could be afforded, that ugliest of all woods "pitch pine," with its coarse grain and hot colour. In colour, in form, all is without beauty. Nor am I thinking so much of those unhappy new towns amongst us, which are devoted, I had almost said doomed, to manufactures and industrial works, where the sky is darkened and all nature disfigured, where the enjoyment of any art is almost impossible. I am thinking rather of modern watering-places—and the like—places devoted to leisure and to pleasure, chosen for their brightness of climate and beauty of scenery, but presently made hideous by a very nightmare of badly designed and worse constructed buildings. In such new towns as I am speaking of the inhabitants live surrounded by these buildings, to the great detriment of all artistic perception. Or look, again, at our London houses of a slightly older, and better, period. Our "long, unlovely streets" are without interest or dignity; a uniform dulness, at best, prevails, with but few exceptions. You may pass through many miles of our London streets without seeing one redeeming building, or even a part of any such building. There is a uniformity of dreary ugliness alike in Camden Town and Belgravia. Whitechapel is better: there are some *old* buildings there. Is not all this a satire on our civilisation and on our culture?

It is easy for you in these days to compare and contrast such modern buildings with ancient ones. If you have not travelled, nor even seen much of old places in England, drawings and photographs will have, broadly, shown you the contrast. And what a contrast it is! Now in what does this contrast principally consist? It is a difference in kind, not one merely of degree; the whole feeling, the *animus*, is different.

And here I am brought to speak of some of those principles and characteristics of architectural design which I would bring before you.

They are:—Refinement—Concentration—True Use of Detail—Symmetry—Economy of Material—Contrast—Avoidance of Extravagance of Manner—Suitability—Harmony—Colour—Work founded on that of the Past—Consonance with Nature—and, lastly, Truth.

Now, if there is one principle in the practice of architecture in the present day which is chiefly wanting, it is, I think, the lack of refinement of design.

What is the history of architectural art but the history of refinement in the art. We have briefly glanced at this history in our own land. What was the one principle that led on from century to century, from style to style, but that of a true artistic feeling, the desire for refinement. Nature, our great guide, never stops in her refinement. We cannot gauge the infinite delicacy of nature, nor her redundancy of life and its variety. Now it is in refinement for architectural work that this expression of life is chiefly shown. According to the material and means at command, there should be the careful expression of artistic power to bring out, to the utmost, the expression of *life*.

This expression is a great principle of all art, and one to which limits can hardly be assigned. It should animate all your work. Every detail, not only as in the carving of natural ornament, however conventionalised, but in architectural mouldings and the like, should express this, which is the highest gift of nature—*life*. You see it in all good architectural work—in the branching vaults, and the graceful clustered columns from which they spring, in the steady, sturdy, but thrusting buttress, in the varied modelling of carved ornaments, or even in the mouldings of a cornice or of a stringcourse. Whatever in architectural work is endowed with the expression of death is bad art. Good art, on the contrary, is ever imbued with the expression of life. Look at a bit of decorative carving, it may be of the most conventional kind, as the so-called “honeysuckle” of the Greeks, or carved leafage of one of the great periods of Gothic art, and you will find this expression of life in the nervous curves, in the strength of the sturdy stem, and the delicate reaching or twisting spray. The whole drawing and modelling, as well as the execution, express life. You may see this even in the common utensils of daily use. Compare a Greek cup, of the simplest kind, with its subdued, refined, but nervous and animated curves, with the similar vessels we may see amongst us now. The one is instinct with the expression of life, the other is dead as the metal or the clay out of which it was formed. It is thus that man, into whom was breathed the breath of life, has, God-like, imbued his work with the expression of the Divine attribute.

Now, it is refinement of design that is such a great aid in giving this expression of life. It is not against this principle that much of the best architectural ornament is conventional, for conventional ornament should ever be imbued with the spirit of nature—with its energy, its repose, its beauty of detail and its breadth of effect.

You can work out this idea of refinement for yourselves in many interesting details—as in the refinement of curves, so remarkable a feature in our fourteenth-century Gothic—in mouldings in all the great styles, giving refinement in the effect of delicate shadows; and in many other ways, as in the refinement of decorative colour, where gradations are gentle and colours are delicately contrasted—not, however, in any work in a manner indicative of weakness or incapacity; for refined work in no sense denotes weakness, nor vulgarity strength. True refinement, rather, denotes restrained power.

Nor is it in details only that the principle of refinement is of importance. The whole building, in its lines and mass, should have the same expression, one rather of reserve and power controlled than of any ostentation or display.

It is these expressions which give the charm to so many ancient works of architecture. *They are the principles of Nature.*

I have spoken of the advance of refinement in the successive styles of the Gothic period. The same history occurred in the great Classic styles. It would seem that while an art is a living and healthy one, it will advance, and, like the intellectual or moral condition of man, it will progress. Alas that a time should come when it begins to decay, and at length becomes moribund!

The English woodwork of the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth centuries shows a school of art of a very remarkable character. There is the utmost refinement of detail in delicacy of moulded work and in most able carvings. It was hardly equalled by any work of the same character abroad. It is work well worth your close attention and study. Comparing these beautiful works with much modern woodwork, one cannot but miss the element of refinement. In the old work you will find the traceries were more or less elaborately moulded in different orders, while a modern and a very crude fashion of the day merely pierces certain shapes, in a very elementary manner. It is but childish work at best, and is

an instance of what one cannot but call the barbarism of much modern work, contrasting with the refinement of the ancient manner.

Let us glance for a moment at the reverse of this element of refinement. Look at what has been called the "Victorian style." I do not mean work designed, in an honest spirit, to meet the requirements of the times, that which tries to catch the true spirit of old work, but that shallow, conceited, and futile attempt to outdo the works of the past by coarseness and what is vulgarly called "go" in design. It is a manner that can have no lasting influence, one would hope, and we may dismiss it as out of court, except to point a moral. It is a manner the very reverse of that which I would lead you to follow—that of a true and noble refinement in your art; that which you will find, in different degrees, expressed in all noble ancient architecture.

Another principle on which I would touch is that of concentration of ornament, especially for our larger buildings. It is one too much neglected in modern architectural works.

For the enjoyment of richness and beauty of ornament there should be a well-designed concentration of it. The eye wearies of, and the mind fails to be interested with, a monotony of richness.

Design your building in good proportions, that is, with the proportion that has an expression, suiting the character you wish to give your work. Then enrich the chief and most important parts with carefully designed ornament rather than sprinkle the whole with it. Here, of course, the scale of the building dictates the character, and it is no fault for a small one to be enriched all over: it is, as it were, a detail itself. The surrounding buildings may give the necessary effect of contrast. But for large and monumental works you will find this concentration of ornament a sound and judicious principle. It is one of the characteristics of the best old buildings.

Another principle of which I would speak is that of the true use of detail. Now the use of detail is not so much in order to show variety or beauty of design, but that it may enhance the expression, whatever that may designedly be, that is to be given to the whole building. It is surprising how the use of detail, skilfully dealt with, may add scale to a building and enhance its general effect. It is a great but manifest error to suppose that by boldness of detail you make your building look large. The reverse is eminently the case. This is obvious; nevertheless, much modern Gothic work, and not work in that style alone, has been ruined in effect by largeness, if not coarseness, of detail. When your mouldings are large their curves should be especially delicate and subdued. The delicacy of the shadows prevents the effect of any coarseness.

Not that it is only detail which, carefully used, gives scale to a building. The multiplication of parts is an arrangement of much use for this purpose. You know how skilfully this was done in mediæval and in Renaissance buildings.

The study of the best-designed ancient works will make the intention very apparent. It is a point, again, that you can work out for yourselves, in studying such buildings. Compare, for example, Milan Cathedral with our Westminster Abbey, or with York Minster or other great Gothic churches. To give scale by breaking up a wall into stages, as by arcades and the like, is of frequent occurrence, and is of much effect.

Another principle on which I would touch is that of symmetry or balance in design. It is one, for the most part, applicable and of chief use for large buildings and those of monumental character; nevertheless, a house of moderate dimensions, planned on a symmetrical arrangement, may have a repose and a dignity fitting many sites. Our large Elizabethan houses owe much of their effect, externally, to this arrangement. It is not a Gothic idea; nevertheless, even for this style a forced irregularity is always to be avoided. There is no

plan for a large house, standing by itself, more dignified and quiet in effect than one with three sides of a quadrangle—the entrance with its high porch marking the centre, and bearing, it may be, an enriched panel with shield and other sculptured ornament. The two projecting wings may be of more or less projection, as circumstances dictate.

In these symmetrical designs occasional variation from exact balance may well be brought in, as in the somewhat varied positions or sizes of windows and the like. The general balance may be kept, but, like an unexpected note in music, the variation in no way destroys the general effect of harmony. Symmetry of design denotes care and pains on the part of the designer. It is a courteous manner, and has much to recommend it. Certainly it is a principle founded on nature. It was in constant use in old days.

Another point on which I would briefly touch is that of a nice economy in the use of material. It is again another point of refinement. The almost brutal strength and ponderous use of material of the Egyptian work, especially as in the Pyramids, has an unpleasant sentiment. Contrast this with the great Gothic buildings, in which (*with no economy of thought or of skill*), through delicate ribs of curved or straight stone, the weight of the hanging vault is held, as if by magic, and passed down into the ground—all with the nicest economy and without any undue waste. Each member does its work. It is Christian liberty and carefulness, contrasted with Egyptian slavery and its waste of power.

Roman work had some of this Egyptian-like waste. But I must not enlarge on this point, which opens out a wide field of observation; one word, nevertheless, I would add, and it is this. Engineers make their nice calculations, of less and more, and tell us this or that "will stand." But good architecture is not only "built to stand," it is built to last from generation to generation. It is no waste to build in such a manner that the eye and the mind are satisfied, that centuries may see the building as we see it now. That if but properly tended, and not cruelly dealt with by the more ruthless hand of man, the gentle, slow, natural decay of time will leave the inheritance well-nigh untouched.

Such strength, combined with a nice economy, should be our aim in designing buildings.

Another principle I would speak of is that of well-contrasted work. In all the best architecture you will find a noble simplicity of design, due breadth of surface, contrasted with delicate detail. Neither has its full value without the other. How well the delicate Gothic traceries and niche work, and the lines of the richly carved cornices, contrast with the broad surfaces of the massive buttresses and the smooth ashlar of the walls! It is thus in nature you may see the delicate foliage and the fragile flower contrasting with the buttress-like rocks, smoothed by the hand of time.

Some of the best effects of Gothic work are obtained by the use of thick walls and small detail, as in windows where the broad splay is finished by a slender shaft, giving a fine line of light and a delicate shadow, contrasting with the uniform light on the wide breadth of surface of the splayed jamb. Here, again, you can work out this principle for yourself in many ways, both as shown in examples of the past and in designing new buildings or their details. In many churches in the South of France we see the capitals throughout, both large and small, elaborately and richly carved, while the rest of the building is of the sternest simplicity. The capitals form, as it were, rich bands, contrasting with the plain walls and piers.

Again you will find that the whole practice of mouldings is derived from the sense of contrasted light and shade. Vigorous, at times even harsh, as in some early Gothic work, the system of mouldings became gradually refined to the most gentle gradations of light and shade, the simple roll moulding eventually turning into what is termed the "wave moulding" with the most delicate effect of light and shade on its surface.

Or, again, in carved work of the great times, the delicate lines of light on the ridges and the edges of the ornament; the half shadows, tender and slight, on which the ornament seems, as it were, to rest; then the sudden deepening and darkening of the background, to throw out, in strongest contrast, the chief points of the ornament into greater light, to rule over the rest. Well considered, and ably executed, contrast is seen everywhere, full of tender grace or decided vigour.

The carver has delighted in the effect nature affords everywhere, where there is light to see its subtlety. It is our loss that here, in England, our dark days are so frequent. The want of light has, no doubt, a depressing effect on art. Let us the more carefully enlighten our mind's eye with the thoughtful contemplation of the works of other and sunnier countries, and of brighter days of art.

Another suggestion that I would make is a negative one—the avoidance of extravagance of design and manner. For example, avoid extravagant proportions. One has seen too much of this of late in Gothic work. A shaft only two or three times its diameter in height is surmounted by a capital out of all proportion to that shaft. It is an ugly affectation and in no way commendable. It is an exaggeration that becomes a caricature of good art.

There is one kind of strongly marked proportion, however, that we need hardly fear to carry out in these days. I mean that of considerable height. The controlling exigencies of economy too often prevent our churches, for example, from rising into stately and inspiring proportions.

You know the high proportion of that, perhaps the most beautiful of all Gothic churches in the world, Westminster Abbey—the most beautiful as regards the architecture of the interior.

The proportion of Westminster Abbey, that of three squares, is excellent, and without any undue exaggeration of height.

The extravagance of manner I have spoken of more often lends itself to stumpy proportion, without grace or beauty. It is, like other extravagances, to be avoided.

Another principle I would bring before you is to suit your design to the place it is meant for, and to the surroundings among which you are to build.

With our old buildings in the country one often sees an instinctive harmony with the sentiment of the aspect of the natural scenery, or, it may be, a wise contrast with it.

It was not apart from this refined feeling that for an old Gothic church, built among hills, you will generally find a low broad tower, with an affinity for the masses of surrounding scenery—while, on the other hand, on the long, low, level lands the pointing spire will have been lifted in contrast to the horizontal line of the plain—a point of relief which the traveller's eye may rest on, as he travels through the monotonous level country. In towns you may take pains, in some way, to assimilate your building to those of neighbouring ones of former times, if there be any of sufficient interest to command such respect.

It is to our loss that so many towns, in which we may have to build, are destitute of any character with which we can harmonise our work. Nevertheless, it should be done where possible, not only in the use of local material, but in designing in the local manner, and in harmony with the surrounding buildings. One sees examples of what we must call "bad manners" in this way. The surroundings have been ignored.

And here let me say that we need not go abroad to find a style in which to design buildings in England. Let us keep to the *genius loci*.

Both in Gothic and in Renaissance buildings among us, there has been too much copying of a foreign manner, unwisely imported from the Continent. Our own English architecture is second to none on the Continent for beauty and poetry of design. If abroad the architecture

is more grandiose, yet it often lacks the refinement and the poetry of sentiment of our English work. Though "art speaks the tongue of every clime," yet, in a sense, we may have a patriotism in our art. You know how long a list of admirable English works one might enumerate: each county with its hundreds of more or less beautiful churches, and often still more beautiful remains of ruined abbeys; each city with its more or less stately cathedral; our Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, places unique in the world for venerable collegiate buildings; our great historical mansions, Haddon, Burleigh, Kirby, Fountains Hall, Hardwick, Longleat, Bramshill, Montacute, Temple Newsam, and others; lastly, the refined and simple beauty of our old homesteads, and even cottages, on many a countryside. Let us be loyal to the traditions of our beautiful English architecture.

Another principle is an obvious one—that of harmony, not only of style, but of character and feeling, throughout a building. No eclectic school which mingles styles incongruously will ever be long-lived or successful. The result, if not one of continuous discord, affords but occasional harmony. It is true that certain styles, as Gothic, lend themselves to strong construction, while Renaissance may be more consonant with great richness and delicacy of detail, as, for example, in plaster-work and the like; but there is a risk of discordant character. It is better not to attempt any such mingling of styles in a complete work, however good the effect of different styles, combined maybe in an historical building which has been added to from time to time. The mind is satisfied with such an historical building, but it is irritated by the needless conceit of combined styles in a new one.

If you look at any complete works of the great periods, you will find that they have a unity of feeling and a breadth of effect stamped upon them. Look at our Abbeys of Westminster and Tintern. I mention these, for you know them well. The same character is given to the whole building in a marvellous degree. Each building expresses in its own distinctive manner the sentiment desired, and there is a true artistic breadth of effect and of idea. You will find this so in all complete buildings of the great periods. They are interpenetrated with one idea, though there is the utmost variety of detail.

Another and an important part of an architect's work is connected with *colour*, whether in the use of marble or other constructional colour, or in painting.

A fine eye for colour is a natural gift, as much as a fine ear for music, but the love of good colour may, no doubt, be caught from the teachings of nature and the great schools of painting, chiefly those of the fourteenth century and later on. That there was a great school of decorative painting in England in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries is seen by the painted roofs and screens remaining. Those without sufficient knowledge are apt to speak of the colouring of the Middle Ages as crude and inharmonious, or at best as of little artistic value. There can be no greater mistake. The wall-painting has chiefly perished, but enough remains on woodwork to show how refined and beautiful the works of decorative painting were. In all the great periods of art there was, indeed, the keenest delight in colour. Take alone, for example, the stained glass of the successive centuries of the Middle Ages. It is an important part of architectural decoration, especially of churches, college halls, and similar places. Look at the deep-toned glass of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the gradually refining glass of the fourteenth century—silver setting, as it were, of jewels; the figures rich and splendid in colour. Then the still fairer glass of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries—figures, as of painted statuary, of rich but subdued colour, standing in tabernacle work, of wrought silver touched with gold, the delight of all beholders. Is it for us to think lightly of the colour works of the Middle Ages when we, in these days, have filled nearly every one of our cathedrals in England, and most of our churches, with glass so crude, so harsh in colour, that to see it for a moment is a pain and a shock to all our artistic feelings?

In this beautiful art of glass-painting, however, one begins to see real improvement in the works of some, though but few, artists.

Before I pass on to other matters I would observe that the history of glass and other painting shows the same story of progress in refinement (pardon the refrain) as we have seen took place in building. The early work was powerful, but crude in colour, the later ever becoming more and more refined; and this so much so that presently the whole scheme and idea of the decorative treatment of the building was gradually changed. For the early building had its walls white, with but little decoration, and its windows of dark richly coloured glass.

In the time of the fifteenth century this scheme of colour was completely changed, and a nobler manner prevailed; the walls were painted with figures and subjects in dark rich colour, of the beautiful type of full but harmonious colour that we see in many old German and Flemish pictures; and the windows were, for the most part, of silvery white, with but little, and that subdued, colour.

It was a complete revolution. It was one towards refinement.

Let us turn for a moment to a very different branch of this subject of colour. However poor the architectural character of our houses may be, beauty of colour may be obtained for our rooms. There is not enough intelligent interest spent on the subject of the decorative effect of our houses. I cannot but express the hope that they may be made more beautiful in colour, and that our rooms may show not only a jumbled collection of old things, however beautiful these may be in themselves, but that intentional design and harmonious architectural character may be given to them. In the modern decorative treatment of rooms, even those of some dignity, one too often sees mistakes of the most evident kind. For example, it is the frequent modern practice to colour the cornice of a room as if it were part of the ceiling; so if the ceiling is white the cornice is white also, though the walls and woodwork be of colour. Now surely the cornice is the crown of the wall, and not a part of the ceiling. The architectural value of a cornice in a room is to soften off the harsh line that we get without any projecting moulding. This effect is obviously lost if the cornice is coloured like the ceiling, and not like the wall. I would just say, before quitting this part of our subject, that while we now often see "dadoes" introduced, the use of the frieze is too seldom adopted. Yet it is a far better effect to have a well-designed frieze and no dado, rather than to have a dado and no frieze. The frieze, and not the dado, was the earlier and finer arrangement. Let me say, in passing, that we should do better in our domestic work to follow the style of the Renaissance rather than that which is called "Queen Anne," and which is a very inferior manner at best.

Again, there is a fashion for a papered dado. This brings out with undue prominence the poor, thin line of the dado moulding.

Now this dado moulding or "chair rail" is, as it were, the cornice of the dado, and the whole should be of the same colour. Above this dado moulding there may be a wall-paper of good pattern and colour. Such a paper is best when it is of two or three shades of the same colour, and the spotty and unarchitectural effect of a variously coloured pattern is avoided. Wall-papers were the successors of damask silk hangings, which were usually of one colour, or different shades of the same colour. These silk hangings, it is true, were the successors of tapestry of varied colour, but the pictured scenes of tapestry take one into a higher and altogether different kind of decorative effect. There is nothing in common with tapestry in them, except that both are for the clothing of a wall.

Again, one sees other palpable mistakes of colour, such as the use of the "black pointing" of brickwork. We need not add to the gloom and dinginess of our buildings by its use.

But what I would chiefly urge, on this subject, is that you should not think decorative

art in any way beneath your serious attention. Here, again, look at the works of the past and of the great schools of Europe. They will be of more use to you than the imitation of Japanese or Chinese work, the fashion of the day, however ingenious it may be.

Another principle is the founding designs on the works of the past.

Sir Joshua Reynolds said, "The more extensive your acquaintance is with the works of those who have excelled, the more extensive will be your powers of invention, and, what may appear still more like a paradox, the more original will be your conceptions."

This is, I think, eminently true of architectural design. You may well found your design on some previously executed work that has won your respect and admiration; but you make it your own, your mind's eye seeing it, thus or thus, different, wholly altered, from that which produced the idea. It is thus that art hands on, in the tradition of art, the spirit of it, which is immortal.

Another principle is that of harmony and consonance with nature.

We have, incidentally, spoken of nature as the guide in all art.

It should be eminently so with the creative art of architecture.

Though our art, like music, is not an imitative one, yet its characteristics should be those of nature, in the spirit, though not in the letter. It is the strength and the delicacy, the refinement and the richness, and the other great attributes of nature, which we should endeavour to embody in our works, rather than any exact imitation.

It is thus that art should be consonant with nature. Wordsworth wrote,

"To the solid ground
Of nature trusts the mind that builds for aye,
Convinced that there, there only, she can lay
Secure foundations."

In our art, from the rough, rock-like foundations to the highest and most delicate pinnacle, all should be in harmony with nature and her work. It is the law for all art, at once the law and the gospel.

Time suffices not to speak of other principles of our art, and yet there remains one great and leading principle of this, and all art, that which should indeed be first, the principle of *Truth*. Let it have here, as in a procession of state, the most honoured place, and be the last-named of our principles.

Of truth, as expressed in architecture, much has been written, and written well, more especially by Mr. Ruskin, to whose teaching we owe so much in the whole field of art. Truth is an essential element of good art. I need not dwell on this part of our subject; nevertheless, what are many of our new street fronts in the City, and other buildings elsewhere, rising around us, but examples of most untruthful architecture. Iron columns and iron girders are concealed by stone columns and thin stone friezes and the like deceptions. It is an unpleasant and, indeed, a wretched style of building, without truth or dignity. Should a fire try the nature of the work, the writhing columns and the bending girders will soon show that they are found wanting in that first necessity of good building—stability—and the disguise will be manifest.

To conclude, let me say that architecture, and all art, should be animated by some great and leading principle. Religion is the highest. The noblest buildings in the world have ever been those consecrated to her service. We see this alike in the pagan temple and in the great churches of Christendom.

After religion, civil or national dignity should call out the expression of high artistic power. Then the domestic feeling, the house, great or small, built for a family, in successive

generations, to abide in, the house that should be handed down as the shrine of domestic honour. And, lastly, honour to the departed, as in sculptured monuments and memorial buildings. For art should be delighted in, not for itself alone, but as the expression, in a lasting way, that can perpetuate the feeling expressed.

Art requires, as it were, the salt of noble sentiment to keep it elevated and pure.

How far any revival of a great school of architecture is possible is a question. That there is a strong archæological feeling for the art is certain. It is an age of travel, and the great works of former days, combined with their historical associations, have impressed themselves strongly on many minds.

The want of unity of feeling, as compared with other times, is one serious impediment to the formation of any school of the art. Is any such unity possible? Is any such school of architecture possible without such unity?

But consider that it is the *animus* with which you design that is of real import; whatever style you are led to work in, let your manner be courteous, your expression that of truth, and your aim to do the right thing for the building you are designing.

No doubt our work as architects in these days is one of difficulty. It is an age of science, not of art; architectural tradition has been cut off, or rather, alas! we inherit a century or more of bad tradition.

We have great facilities, in these days of easy travel, for seeing old buildings. Or, to take the subject of decorative art work generally, our collections and museums are numerous and admirable. Are we to make such use of them as may lead to better designs, and a more intelligent interest, in such decorative work?

Such collections ought to bring about a more healthy state of public taste, and inspire us all with a desire to do good work, thorough work, both awakening interest and cultivating it.

Let us remember that what we may call the "architectural arts" may have a considerable bearing on the industries of a country. Attempts at artistic manufacture have been brought before the public. Are they to lead to better things, or are they only the fashions of a day?

Have enthusiasm for your art, in all its branches, rather than an ambition for your own success, and better work will be done. There are some signs of the dawn of better things amidst the general gloom, and we may hope that a more intelligent interest may yet be taken in architecture, and in things that belong to architecture.

Students of this Institute, if I have in any small degree raised your enthusiasm for your art, these few words may not have been all in vain. You are entering a delightful profession. Make it more and more not only a professional business but a real living Art. Remember, Architecture should be the Queen of all the arts.

G. F. BODLEY.

In connection with the foregoing the following two poems by Mr. Bodley are published with the Author's kind permission:—

ARCHITECTURE.—THE MINSTER.

VAST power of the greatest of all arts!
Greatest, for most akin to Nature's work,
And most creative of the works of men!
Thine is the spirit of Creation's work,

Imbued with beauty of the simplest flower,
Instinct with grandeur of the mountain side !

All Nature stoops and yields her service here.
Not this, nor that, is seen but very *life*
Of Nature, breathed in rich redundancy,
That grows into a temple, made with hands ;
But, vivified by soul and mind of man,
It stands the very image of God's work.

How many hands have wrought, one mind conceived !
Yet seems it as one great harmonious chord,
Full and complete, that soundeth lastingly
Through all the massive time it shall endure.
Stern storms of heaven may beat against its walls,
The blanching sunlight sleep upon its roof ;
Perchance both deem it part of Nature's work,
That needs must be so disciplined by all
Vicissitudes,—as o'er the mountain Dome
Or gloomy clouds obscure or rain-storms sweep,
Or loving sunbeams rest them all the day.

So stands the mighty Fane, and takes its share
Of all, as mountains do, now smiling back
To heaven's smile, then darkening to its frown,
Claiming, and owning, its full share of all.

Now enter in. Ah, words may not express
What heart of man hath yearned to conceive ;
The finite dowered with Infinitude !

WHEN music, new born, falls on wakening ears,
And grows to fullest consonance of sound,
It, lingering, haunts the mind a little while,
Passing and dying, all too soon, away.

When fair a building, risen, stands revealed—
Music made manifest—it is for aye.

The moving air makes music in the trees,
Whispering and sighing ; rising, dying now ;
The enduring mountain liveth evermore,
Smiles in the sunlight, frowns beneath the storm,
And stands a felt, though unseen, presence in the night.

So doth the massive Minster ; now it glooms
Dim, 'gainst the golden glory of the West ;
Anon it kindles, lit from dawning East,
A steadfast vision, clear, articulate.

From *Poems*, by G. F. Bodley, A.R.A. F.S.A.
Lond. George Bell & Sons, 1899.



9, CONDUIT STREET, LONDON, W., 10th Feb. 1900.

CHRONICLE.

The Annual Exhibition of Students' Competition Drawings.

The designs and drawings submitted for the Institute Prizes and Studentships 1900, together with the work sent in by past Travelling Students, made up perhaps the largest collection ever brought together in connection with these competitions. Owing to insufficiency of space for their adequate display in the Institute rooms, the use was secured of the neighbouring gallery of the Alpine Club, Savile Row, where the works could be satisfactorily hung, and seen to better advantage than has been possible for some years past. The exhibition included, besides the competitive drawings, a selection from the "Testimonies of Study" submitted by candidates successful in last year's Final and Intermediate Examinations—these comprising drawings by the following:—Messrs. W. H. Ansell and T. J. Byrne (*December Final*) and Messrs. L. L. Bright (*June Intermediate*) and C. E. Varndell (*December Intermediate*). Nearly nine hundred persons visited the exhibition during the eleven days (January 16–27) it was open to the public.

Prize Drawings for Exhibition at Allied Centres.

The following selection from the Prize Drawings and the Testimonies of Study above mentioned will be sent for exhibition at the chief centres of the districts of the Allied Societies throughout the United Kingdom:—

The Royal Institute Silver Medal (Measured Drawings).—St. John's College (3 strainers), by Mr. James B. Fulton (under motto "Unicorn"), awarded the Medal and Ten Guineas.—Raynham Hall (3 strainers), by Mr. H. Inigo Triggs (device "White Wheel"), awarded Hon. Mention.

The Soane Medallion.—Design for a School of Fine Art (1 strainer), by Mr. Cyril E. Power (motto "S. Barbara"), awarded the Medallion and £100.

The Owen Jones Studentship.—Drawings by Mr. Geo. A. Paterson (3 strainers) awarded the Certificate and £100.—Drawings by Mr. James B. Fulton (2 strainers), awarded Medal of Merit.

—Drawings by Mr. J. Hervey Rutherford (2 strainers), awarded Medal of Merit.—Drawings by Mr. Sidney K. Greenslade (1 strainer).

The Pugin Studentship.—Drawings by Mr. James McLachlan (3 strainers), awarded the Medal and £40.—Drawings by Mr. J. A. Woore (2 strainers), awarded Medal of Merit.—Drawings by Mr. John Jerdan (1 strainer), awarded Medal of Merit.—Drawings by Mr. Shirley Harrison (1 strainer).

The Tite Prize.—Design for an Isolated Clock Tower (2 strainers), by Mr. Percy E. Nobbs (motto "Edificaturus"), awarded the Certificate and £30.—Perspective and Elevation (2 strainers), by Mr. W. A. Mellon (motto "Bow Bells"), awarded Medal of Merit.—Perspective (1 strainer), by "Sphinx."

The Grissell Medal.—Design for a Spiral Staircase (2 strainers), by Mr. Charles E. Varndell (motto "Loire"), awarded Gold Medal and £10 10s.

Testimonies of Study (20 sheets).—Drawings by Messrs. W. H. Ansell and T. J. Byrne (*Final Examination*).—Drawings by Messrs. L. L. Bright and C. E. Varndell (*Intermediate Examination*).

The Annual Addresses and Prize Distribution.

The Presentation of Prizes and the introduction of the year's Travelling Students took place at the Institute last Monday before a numerous assembly of members and their friends, several ladies being among the visitors. As many of the premiated drawings as could be accommodated were hung on screens round the Meeting-room. The names of the prize-winners will be found in the Deed of Award published in the last number of the JOURNAL.

The President's Address to Students, and Mr. Bodley's Criticism of the Drawings, happily supplemented by extracts from an Address to R.A. students, now published in these pages for the first time, were followed with manifest approval by the whole assembly, the authors being warmly applauded at the close. Sir James Linton [*H.A.*], Past President of the Royal Institute of Painters in Water Colours, in proposing a vote of thanks, said he did so very warmly and sincerely for the extremely able Addresses the Meeting had been privileged to hear. He spoke, he said, as a member of one branch of the Art, for the broad and simple principles placed before them by the President and Mr. Bodley appealed to the painter quite as much as to the architect. The Vote of Thanks was briefly seconded by Mr. Axel Haig, and carried by acclamation.

The Royal Gold Medal 1900.

At the same General Meeting the President made the following statement:—I have to announce that the Council propose to submit the name of the Commendatore Rodolfo Lanciani to

Her Most Gracious Majesty as the recipient of the Royal Gold Medal this year. It is usually the custom to give it to a foreigner about every third year. Signor Lanciani is Professor of Ancient Topography in the University of Rome; he is a D.C.L. of Oxford and LL.D. of Harvard, a Correspondent of the Institute of France, and he has been a Corresponding Member of the Institute since 1894. He has contributed more to our knowledge of ancient Rome than any other writer or archaeologist since the time of Luigi Canina over fifty years ago, whose works we have in our Library, some thirty volumes in number. Canina received the Queen's Gold Medal in 1849, more particularly for his work entitled *The Edifices of Ancient Rome*. Should Her Majesty graciously consent to our proposal it will be the second time during Her Majesty's reign that the honour has gone to Italy. Signor Lanciani's first notable work, entitled *Ancient Rome in the Light of Recent Discoveries*, was published in 1887, almost concurrently with Professor Middleton's work on the same subject. This was followed in 1892 by *Pagan and Christian Rome*. These books take the highest rank as guide-books for students of the archaeology and architecture of the Eternal City and its neighbourhood.

In 1897 he published a supplementary work of equal value on the *Ruins and Excavations of Ancient Rome*, throwing considerable light on many disputed points connected with the ancient monuments and edifices. Perhaps, however, his reputation as a distinguished and learned student of architecture, archaeology, and topography will be mainly associated with another work, namely, *Forma Urbis Rome*, which has been issued in sections, and is now nearly completed. This is a document of the greatest value; it is drawn to a large scale, in forty-six sheets; and I hope it will soon find a place in our Library.

How great Professor Lanciani's opportunity has been may be gathered from his statement in a preface to one of his books. He says that between the 1st of January 1872 and the 31st of December 1885 eighty-two miles of new streets were opened up, drained, paved, and built in Rome. The archaeological significance of this may be grasped when it is learned that no less than 270,000,000 of cubic feet of earth were turned up; and it must be remembered that it is impossible to open up much ground in Rome without something unexpected being revealed.

Professor Lanciani and his colleagues discovered the stratum of prehistoric or traditional times. They found a necropolis older than the walls of Servius Tullius, brought to light 5,000 feet of the great embankment of Servius, and ascertained the sites of fourteen gates, houses, palaces, temples, shrines, parks, gardens, aqueducts, and tombs, whose existence had been scarcely suspected.

The Professor has thrown light on various

phases of the life of the ancient city, with a fidelity and charm rarely at the command of the archaeologist.

He, like Dr. Schliemann, who received the Queen's Gold Medal in 1885, has earned a European reputation. The Council therefore think Professor Lanciani would be a most worthy recipient of this honour, if Her Majesty will graciously consent to its being conferred upon him.

John Ruskin and the Royal Gold Medal.

The following letters written by Ruskin, in which he declines, and gives his reason for declining, the Royal Gold Medal, have hitherto been unpublished. The formal one to the Secretary was not even read at the time to the general body of the Institute. As nearly thirty years have elapsed since the letters were written, and as the illustrious author has just passed away, there seems to be no reason not to take advantage of this opportunity of making them public. Though their criticism is severe they cannot fail to be of interest; and they are eminently characteristic of the lofty-minded irreconcilable who in his actions came as near putting into practice his own counsels of perfection as is given to a man to do.

Rome, 20th May 1874.

DEAR SIR,—I have before me your favour of the 25th March, advising me of the honour done me by the Royal Institute of British Architects in adjudging to me the Royal Medal for 1874.

The delay in my reply has been owing to the necessity for prolonged reflection before adopting the line of conduct which, after such reflection, I still find to be the only one open to me. Permit me in explanation of it to state four facts.

1. The tomb of the Cardinal Brancaccio at Naples, which, so far as my present knowledge extends, is the most important example in Europe of the architectural sculpture of the fifteenth century, is at present used as the lumber-room of the church in which it stands; and I found, last month, the folds of the drapery of its caryatides closed by cobwebs.

2. The church of San Miniato at Florence, the most beautiful example of the twelfth-century architecture in that city, has been turned into a common cemetery.

3. As I was drawing the cross carved on the spandril of the western arch of the church of Santa Maria della Spina at Pisa, in 1872, it was dashed to pieces by a mason before my eyes, and the pieces carried away, that a model might be carved from them and set up in its stead.

4. The railway at Furness is carried so near the Abbey that the ruins vibrate at the passing of every luggage train; and the buildings connected with the station block the window over the altar of the Abbot's Chapel; so that nothing else can be seen through it.

These four facts are, as the members of the Institute know, only too accurately illustrative of the general agency of the public, and of the builders employed by them, on the existing architecture of Europe;—consisting in the injurious neglect of the most precious works; in the destruction, under the name of restoration, of the most celebrated works, for the sake of emolument; and in the sacrifice of any and all to temporary convenience.

For the existence of this state of things we, the members, actual and honorary, of the Institute of British Architects, are assuredly answerable, at least in England; and under these circumstances I cannot but feel that it is no time for us to play at adjudging medals to each other; and must, for my own poor part, very solemnly decline concurrence in such complimentary formalities, whether as they regard others or myself. For we have none of us, it seems to me, any right remaining either to bestow or to receive honours; and least of all those which proceed from the Grace, and involve the Dignity, of the British Throne.

May I beg, Sir, that in communicating my reply to the members of the Institute you will convey to them at the same time the assurance of my personal respect, and of the profound regret with which I find myself compelled to decline their intended kindness and courtesy?—I have the honour to be, Sir, your obedient servant,

JOHN RUSKIN.

Charles L. Eastlake, Esq., Secretary.

Assisi, 12th June 1874.

MY DEAR SIR GILBERT,—I have this morning received your letter, which adds not a little to the pain I have felt in doing what I know to be necessary in this case. It adds to the pain—it farther assures me of the necessity of my proceeding. That it should have been a friend who “suggested” my name to the Institute makes me bitterly sorry to put this friend in (what however only because *he* calls it so, I admit to be) a ridiculous position. But that the Institute acted under his “suggestion” very much adds to such personal motive of pride as I have in refusing the Medal. Had they offered it me after I wrote the *Stones of Venice*, twenty years ago, I should have gratefully and respectfully accepted it. I now, proudly, refuse it. But I have never—very solemnly I say it—allowed my pride to stand in the way of either courtesy or duty. I very solemnly deny, and wish in the face of the public to deny, and am thankful, *though* pained by it, for this opportunity of publicly denying, that either the Architects’ Institute or any other Dominant Association of Artists in England, France, or Italy, is, or can be in the present day, an Association for the Improvement of Architecture, or of any other art by such Dominant Associations professed. The primary object of

all such Associations is to exalt the power of their own profession over the mind of the public, power being in the present century synonymous with wealth. And the root of all the evil and ruin which this century has seen (and it has destroyed already more than the French Revolution did of what *that* had left) is summed up in four words, “Commission on the Cost.” And, from any body of architects, however small, who will bind themselves henceforward to accept a given salary (whatever amount, according to their standing, they may choose to name) for their daily work, and to work with their men (or at least with their own hands, on the sculpture of the building) while they take such salary—from such a body I will take a medal to-morrow.

That I have myself failed, I have, as you tell me, again and again confessed. That I have made the most fatal mistakes I have also confessed.

That I have received no help, but met the most scornful opposition in every effort I have ever made which came into collision with the pecuniary interests of modern builders, may, perhaps in a degree more than I know, have occasioned my failure.

But I now recognise many of my mistakes, and hope yet to accomplish something before I die. It may be, but I trust will not be, single-handed, but at all events it must be in association only with men who know their business.

Now, you are well aware that I agree with every word of your Inaugural Address. As I read it—and I have read it all before concluding this answer to your remonstrance—I feel as if you had no other intention in sending it than to justify my proceeding.

But I will employ in my justification only two sentences of it. I will not copy—you can more easily read on my reference—the three lines at the top of page 6. I think they violently overstate my *own* view of the necessities of the profession. I should have written, not “their *whole* heart,” but the whole practical force of their heart. I should have written, not their “single” object, but their “principal” one. Putting that sentence into such milder form, I can only say, if I believed there were ten men in the Institute to whom it could be truly applied, I would take the Medal.

The other sentence I would refer to is in the seventh line from the bottom of page 10.

“The public as a body scarcely know the difference between good architecture and bad.”

On which I must ask further, As a body, does the Institute? If it does, why has it not taught the public?

If it does not, shall I take the Medal, implying the recognition of its authority? I have only to say in conclusion that, having entirely loyal feelings towards the Queen, I will trust to

Her Majesty's true interpretation of my conduct; but, if formal justification of it be necessary for the public, would plead that if a peerage or knighthood may without disloyalty be refused, surely much more this minor grace proceeding from the Monarch may be without impropriety declined by any of her subjects who wish to serve her without reward, under exigency of peculiar circumstances.—Believe me, my dear Sir Gilbert, always faithfully yours,

Sir G. Gilbert Scott, R.A.

J. RUSKIN.

Private.

MY DEAR SIR GILBERT,—I have written the enclosed this morning, under unusual irritation caused me by the ravage of the lower church and miserable repainting of the higher one under the orders of Signor Cavalcaselli, and the destruction of one of the loveliest scenes in Italy, the fountains between the buttresses of Santa Chiara.

I hope I have said nothing more than is right (at least in my view) in consequence of this irritation. But I can only say that if I wrote, or *could* write, as I feel, *any* day of my life, you would pity me, not be angry with me.—Ever faithfully yours,

J. RUSKIN.

The new Architect Associate of the Royal Academy.

The Council at their meeting on Monday, the 5th inst., passed a unanimous vote cordially congratulating Mr. John Belcher [F.] on his recent election to Associateship of the Royal Academy.

The late William White, F.S.A.

William White, F.S.A. [F.], born in 1825, died Monday, 22nd January 1900, aged seventy-four, was a great-nephew of Gilbert White of Selborne, and the third son of the Rev. Francis Henry White, curate of Blakesley, Northamptonshire, and private chaplain to the late Sir Henry Dryden, of Canons Ashby. The Whites of Blakesley were intimate friends of the family of George Gilbert Scott, then a young man, whose home was in the neighbouring parish of Wappenham.

At an early age William White was placed with an architect of good position, Mr. Squirrell of Leamington, in whose office he obtained such knowledge of his profession as might then be had in that way, supplemented by visits to the works and the builders' workshops of the town. Drawing, however, was not cultivated; neither was art much thought of; in these he was self-taught, the churches and ancient buildings of the neighbourhood, to which his knowledge of style was confined, being his school.

On completing his articles he came to London, and worked in the office at Spring Gardens of his early friend George Gilbert Scott. Here he became the intimate associate of George Edmund

Street and George Frederick Bodley, both in their work and on sketching expeditions.

At the age of twenty-two White started in independent practice at Truro, where he designed and carried out certain buildings, consisting of the Bank and Solicitors' Offices, which occupy the site of the old Stannery Court, and afterwards the bank of St. Columb. He built or restored numerous churches in the county, amongst them being Baldin, St. Gerrans, St. Hillary, St. Phil-lack, St. Petroc Minor, Lamorran, and subsequently New Quay, Merifield by Torpoint, Anthony and St. John's. Amongst many domestic works in the same county he undertook the renovation of the ancient and interesting moated Rectory of St. Columb for the Rev. Dr. Samuel Walker.

The important Church of All Saints, Notting Hill, which he built for the same client, brought him again to London about the year 1852. The funds for this building failed, and the lofty tower had to be left without the spire which was designed to have been its complement.

At this time he identified himself with the revival of Gothic architecture, striving to set a proper standard of church arrangement, and, in conjunction with others then engaged in the restoration of ancient fabrics, endeavouring to determine correct principles and just methods of dealing with old work. He became a life member of the Institute in 1859; was especially interested in the work of the Ecclesiological Society, and subsequently became a member of the Professional Committee of the Incorporated Society for the Building and Enlarging of Churches, &c., a position which he held to the end of his life.

White always regretted what appeared to him to be his limited power of drawing; but, having less skill with his pencil than many of his contemporaries, he succeeded, notwithstanding, in stamping on his works the intention of his mind in regard to every detail. He gave to forms, mouldings, and ornament a distinctive character, in harmony not only with the nature of the material, but also with the methods and tools employed by the craftsmen. On the subject of his own methods of work he was reserved, regarding himself as rather a self-taught man. To him everything connected with his art was a delight, chastened by a sense of the inadequacy of the means he possessed to attain the ideal that he had before him. Moreover, like the man of enthusiasm that he was, he relied upon himself alone to do the best he was capable of, trusting to his own common sense, and giving to the workmen the drawings of his own hand, that nothing of his intention might be lost for want of that intention being expressed as clearly as he could through the medium he employed.

He devoted considerable time to the study and definition of certain theories of proportion in

design, which he set forth in the *Ecclesiologist* for 1853, and which have been discussed at the meetings of the Institute.

An appreciative notice of White's work is given in Mr. C. L. Eastlake's *History of the Gothic Revival*, pp. 291-294.

He made numerous communications to the *Ecclesiologist*, *Church Bells*, and the professional journals. The following is a list of his contributions to the TRANSACTIONS R.I.B.A.:—

Newland Church, Gloucestershire, with Remarks on Church Restoration and Arrangements.—*Trans.* 1863-64.

Ironwork: its Legitimate Uses and Proper Treatment.—*Trans.* 1865-66.

On the Measurement of the Obstruction of Ancient Lights.—*Trans.* 1866-67.

Descriptive Sketch of a Mansion at Humewood, co. Wicklow, erecting for Mr. Fitzwilliam Dick.—*Trans.* 1868-69.

Fireproof Closing of Openings under the Building Act.—*Trans.* 1884-85.

Wisby, in the Island of Gotland.—*Trans.* 1885-86.

The Galilee of Durham Cathedral.—*Trans.* 1889-90.

Church Fittings.—*Trans.* 1889-90.

He also contributed to the PROCEEDINGS and JOURNAL of the Institute various articles, notes, and reviews.

He was President of the Architectural Association in 1868-69, and in his time took an active part in the work of the Association.

William White executed a very large number of works, principally churches, schools, and parsonage-houses, a few of considerable magnitude, and all of them distinct in character, simple, reserved, and eminently sincere. His works include, besides those already mentioned, the following:—St. Saviour's, in Aberdeen Park, Highbury; St. Mark's, Battersea Rise; St. Peter's, Plough Lane, with Mission Room adjoining; St. Matthew's, Lavender Hill; St. Mark's, Hanwell. The Cathedrals of Madagascar and Pretoria, and churches at Lyndhurst, New Forest; Masborough, Derwent, and Park Gate, near Sheffield; Elvington, North Ormsby, and Stockton-on-Tees; Sharow, near Ripon; Freemantle and Woolston, near Southampton; Holy Trinity, Barnstaple; Burton, by Banbury; Felbridge, by East Grinstead; Fenny Stratford, Bucks, and Langdon Hills, near Stanford-le-Hope. He carried out church restorations at Newland, in the Forest of Dean, and Adisham, near Dover; West Wittering, Sussex, Preston by Wingham, Great Maplestead, Bletchley, Selbourne, and Witham Friary, built by Hugh of Lincoln.

Among parochial buildings are the schools at North Church, by Berkhamstead, Great Maplestead, Masborough, Longbridge, Deverill, Mevagissey; the Rectories of Ruan-Lanihorne, Cornwall, Stanhoe by Lynn, and Langdon Hills; the Vicarages of Haydour by Sleaford, Great Mapleshead, Beamminster, St. Margaret's at Cliff, Boxgrove, Lyminster, St. Mary Abbot, Kensington, and

two vicarages at Halstead. To his designs were erected country houses at Humewood, in Ireland, for W. W. Fitzwilliam Dick, Esq.; at Winscote, North Devon, for J. C. Moore-Stevens, Esq.; at the How, St. Ives, for the late Gilbert Ansley, Esq.; at Copt-Hewick, and Sharow Lodge, near Ripon. Scholastic houses and buildings at Winchester, Rugby, Eton, Marlborough, Shrewsbury, Haileybury (preparatory school), Barnet, and the Forest School, Walthamstow.

Among Institutions are St. Michael's Home at Wantage, Cottage Hospital at Andover, new wing to training college at Salisbury, and Mission Hall, Pentonville.

Besides restorations enumerated above are the following:—Rectory of Dartington, Devon; the ancient palace of Bishopscourt, near Exeter, with its original chapel; Tarporley Rectory, Cheshire; the Manor House of Marshalls, near Edgware, and Quy Hall, near Cambridge.

THOMAS HENRY WATSON [F.]

In formally announcing Mr. White's death at the last meeting of the Institute, the Hon. Secretary, Mr. Graham, in a few brief remarks, paid a tribute of respect to the high qualities of the deceased. Nearly fifty years ago, Mr. Graham informed the Meeting, William White was a conscientious and successful worker in the school of the Gothic Revival, and he doubted whether in that band of ardent enthusiastic men there was one who paid more respect to the teachings of Welby Pugin, or who had shown in his work his ability to apply the principles enunciated in that school with greater facility than William White. They had lost a worthy man, a faithful member of the Institute, and an architect of high repute. Mr. Graham concluded by asking the Meeting to pass a Resolution of regret and condolence, as entered on the Minutes.

REVIEWS.

THE FUTURE OF BORDIGHERA.

L'avenire di Bordighera. Guglielmo Scott. Bordighera. 1900.

Mr. William Scott (*Soane Medallist 1877*), of Bordighera, has recently published a pamphlet in Italian, dedicated to his Excellency Commendatore Giuseppe Biancheri, member of parliament for the province of Porto Maurizio, including Bordighera, Ventimiglia, &c., and Privy Councillor, on the future of Bordighera, on the Riviera, in which he calls the attention of the municipal authorities to their shortcomings, and makes some useful suggestions with regard to the future of this favourite winter resort.

Mr. Scott points out that according to competent authority the amount expended annually

by foreign visitors to Bordighera is not less than £150,000 sterling, the greater portion of which is contributed by the English; and argues that in order to retain, and if possible to increase, the sum thus expended in the town an effort should be made to conciliate the prejudices of foreigners and to provide additional attractions beyond those furnished by the climate and natural scenery. Before everything else Mr. Scott suggests that the roads at Bordighera, which appear to be in a deplorable condition, should be put in an efficient state for carriage and pedestrian traffic, for which purpose he advocates the employment of the steam roller, the use of which, although adopted in most Continental cities, and even in China and Japan, has not yet penetrated to this part of Italy.

The absence of a public promenade at Bordighera is dwelt upon by the author as a reason for the inferiority of that town as compared with Cannes, Nice, and Mentone, all of which are provided with excellent promenades next the sea, the Promenade des Anglais at Nice being known all over the world. The municipality of Bordighera has recently expended 100,000 lire (£4,000) in laying out a new street, the Traversa, which, as the author asserts, will not attract a single visitor to the town, and he urges with great plausibility that the formation of a promenade adjoining the sea would, if properly carried out, attract hundreds of visitors.

Mr. Scott at the conclusion of his pamphlet apologises for the deficiencies of his literary style, the work being composed in a language not his own. The style, however, leaves nothing to be desired, and Mr. Scott is to be congratulated on the ease with which he makes use of the language of what he calls his second country, towards which he expresses his passionate devotion.

JOHN HEBB.

LEGAL.

Building used partly for Trade and partly as a Dwelling.

THE QUEEN v. SHIEL AND OTHERS.

In this case, before Mr. Justice Channell and Mr. Justice Bucknill on the 1st February, cause was shown on behalf of Messrs. Snwin Bros. & Co. against a rule calling upon a metropolitan police magistrate to state a case upon an information preferred under section 74 of the London Building Act 1894. The section requires that when a building is "used in part for the purposes of trade or manufacture and in part as a dwelling-house" the two parts shall be separated by walls and floors constructed of fire-resisting materials. The information was preferred in respect of a building which was intended to be used in part as a public-house and in part as a dwelling-house, and the question proposed to be raised by the case was whether a public-house was within section 74. The magistrate declined to state a case on the ground that the same point was considered and decided in *Carritt v. Godson* [JOURNAL R.I.B.A., Vol. VI. 1899, p. 460], in which Mr. Justice Day

and Mr. Justice Lawrance, sitting as a Divisional Court, held that a public-house was not within the section. *Carritt v. Godson* was a case decided under a criminal section of the London Building Act 1894, and there was, accordingly, no right of appeal from that decision to the Court of Appeal. The London County Council had taken these proceedings under a different section in order, if possible, that they might take the matter to the Court of Appeal.

Mr. Danckwerts, Q.C., appeared to show cause; and Mr. Avory appeared for the London County Council in support of the rule.

The Court discharged the rule, but gave leave to appeal.

Mr. Justice Channell said that he should not feel at liberty to say that the decision of his learned brothers required reconsideration. Moreover, so far from thinking that *Carritt v. Godson* was wrongly decided, he thought *prima facie* that the decision was right.

District Surveyor's Fees: Payable by Builder, or in his Default by the Owner.

MEESON v. SPRUNG.

At the North London Police Court on 26th January Mr. Fordham delivered judgment in the case of *Meeson v. Sprung*, which was a claim on the part of one of the district surveyors of Hackney for fees to the amount of £1 12s. 6d. due on a building in Windsor Road, Hackney Wick, of which Mr. H. Sprung, of St. Mark's Road, Dalston, is the owner. Mr. Fordham said that the proceedings were taken under section 154 of the London Building Act of 1894, which reads: "There shall be paid by the builder, or in his default by the owner or occupier," the fees, &c. The fees were therefore primarily to be paid by the builder, and it was only when he was in default that the provision for the payment by the owner was made. Consequently, until it was proved that the builder was in default, the owner could not be held to be liable. In the present instance the builder had simply been asked to pay and had refused. Mr. Meeson had at once summoned the owner, without making any attempt to enforce his rights against the builder. He could not hold that simple refusal on the part of the builder was such default as absolved him from his liability and made the owner liable. If this were so, no builder would ever pay as the Act evidently intended that he should. "Default" meant something more than refusal. The summons would be dismissed with £1 1s. costs. As, however, the question did not appear to have arisen before, and there were no decisions on the point, he would be happy to state a case if asked to do so.

The Factory Acts: Means of Escape in case of Fire.

IN RE AN ARBITRATION BETWEEN THE LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL AND LEWIS.

This was a motion, in the Queen's Bench Division on 12th January, to set aside an award made by an umpire in an arbitration under section 7 of the Factory and Workshop Act 1891. Messrs. Lewis were the owners of a building, No. 21, Moor Lane, in the City of London, of which the basement, ground floor, and first floor were let on leases for different terms of years as cloth and toy warehouses, the second, third, and fourth floors containing printing works, which are "non-textile factories" within the meaning of section 93 of the Factory and Workshop Act 1878. The London County Council, as the sanitary authority of the district in which No. 21, Moor Lane, was situate, conceived that these factories were not furnished with adequate means of escape in case of fire. The Factory and Workshop Act 1891, section 7, provides that every factory constructed after the date of the Act is to be furnished with a certificate from the sanitary authority of the district that the factory is provided on the stories above the ground

floor with such means of escape in case of fire as can reasonably be required under the circumstances of each case, and a factory not so furnished is deemed not to be kept in conformity with the Act of 1878. Further, with respect to all factories to which the foregoing provisions do not apply (including in that description the factories at the top of 21, Moor Lane), it is the duty of the sanitary engineer of every district from time to time to ascertain whether all such factories within their district are provided with such means of escape as aforesaid, and, in case of any factory not so provided, to serve on the owner of the factory a notice in writing specifying the measures necessary for providing such means of escape, and requiring him to carry out the same before a specified date, and thereupon such owner is, notwithstanding any agreement with the occupier, to have power to take such steps as are necessary for complying with the requirements, and, unless such requirements are so complied with, such owner is made liable to a fine not exceeding £1 for every day that such non-compliance continues. In case of a difference of opinion between the owner of a factory and the sanitary authority the difference is, on the application of either party, to be referred to arbitration, and the award is made binding on the parties thereto. The London County Council, being of opinion that these floors were not provided with proper means of escape in case of fire, served upon Messrs. Lewis a notice calling upon them to make such structural alterations in the building as should be requisite to provide the upper stories with proper means of escape. Messrs. Lewis not agreeing with the demands of the London County Council, the matter was referred to arbitration. The arbitrators appointed an umpire, who made an award directing, among other things, that a new staircase should be provided from the basement to the top floor, such staircase to be connected with all the floors by means of doors not less than 3 feet 3 inches wide; that a proportion of not less than half of the windows facing Moor Lane on each floor should be made to open of sufficient height and width to allow a full-grown person to pass through in case of need. The award further contained particulars of the materials and manner of and in which the work was to be executed.

Sir R. T. Reid, Q.C., Mr. Macmorran, Q.C., and Mr. J. R. Atkin, for Messrs. Lewis, contended that the award was bad in that it required the owner to enter upon tenements in the possession of third persons with or without their leave or licence. The arbitrator had no jurisdiction to make any such award. The Act of 1895 gave power to the owner to enter upon a factory or several factories where several existed in the same building; but where part of a building was and part was not a factory there was no power given to the owner to enter upon the part which was not a factory.

Mr. Daldy and Mr. Edwardes Jones (Mr. Ivory with them), for the London County Council, contended that the award was merely a statement of what was necessary for the safety of the building.

The Court (Mr. Justice Phillimore and Mr. Justice Bucknill) held that the arbitrators or umpire had no jurisdiction to order the owner to enter upon the tenements unless the whole house were a factory. In this case there were two factories at the top of the house, but the rest of the building was not a factory. The award, however, would not be set aside, but remitted to the arbitrators with a direction to them to consider what alterations, if any, were reasonably requisite under all the circumstances of the case. As, however, the question of the arbitrators' jurisdiction had not been raised earlier, the award was remitted without costs.

MINUTES. VII.

At the Seventh General Meeting (Ordinary) of the Session, held Monday, 5th February 1900, the President, Mr. Wm. Emerson, in the Chair, with 30 Fellows (including 16 members of the Council), 26 Associates (including 1 member of the Council), 3 Hon. Associates, and several visitors, the Minutes of the Meeting held 22nd January 1900 [p. 118] were taken and signed as correct.

The Hon. Secretary having announced the decease of William White, F.S.A., *Fellow*, elected in 1859, moved, and it was thereupon

RESOLVED, that the Institute do record its sincere regret for the loss it has sustained by the death of its Fellow, Mr. William White, and that a vote of condolence with his near relatives be entered on the Minutes of the Meeting and communicated to them.

Mr. R. I. Bennett, *Fellow*, President of the Manchester Society of Architects, attending for the first time since his election, was formally admitted by the President.

The following candidates for membership, found by the Council to be eligible and qualified according to the Charter and By-laws, were recommended for election:—As FELLOWS, David Barclay Niven [*A.* 1890]; William Edward Riley [*A.* 1883], Superintending Architect to the London County Council; Herbert Hardy Wigglesworth [*A.* 1891]. As ASSOCIATES (all the candidates having passed the Qualifying Examination), Francis Henry Allen [*Probationer* 1895, *Student* 1897], Kettering; William Henry Ansell [*Probationer* 1894, *Student* 1896]; Spencer Ellwood Barrow [*Probationer* 1891, *Student* 1894], Lancaster; Francis William Ashton-Buckell [*Probationer* 1892, *Student* 1898]; Thomas Joseph Byrne [*Probationer* 1897, *Student* 1898]; Bessie Ada Charles [*Probationer* 1893, *Student* 1896]; David McLeod Craik [*Probationer* 1893, *Student* 1896]; Alfred Herbert Foster [*Probationer* 1896, *Student* 1897]; Frank Foster; Stanley Hinge Hamp [*Probationer* 1896, *Student* 1897]; John Harry Woodall Hickton, Walsall; Mathew Honan [*Probationer* 1896, *Student* 1897], Liverpool; Herbert Edward Illingworth [*Probationer* 1893, *Student* 1895], Leeds; Alfred Ralph Keighley [*Probationer* 1892, *Student* 1895], Liverpool; Thomas Anderson Moodie [*Probationer* 1890, *Student* 1895]; James Edward Coleman Shield [*Probationer* 1892, *Student* 1895]; John Edward Spain [*Probationer* 1895, *Student* 1898], Wragby, Lincs.; Reginald Henry Spalding [*Probationer* 1894, *Student* 1897]; Frederick Taylor, Aylesbury, Bucks; Ramsay Traquair [*Probationer* 1894, *Student* 1896]; Thomas Tyrwhitt [*Probationer* 1894, *Student* 1896]; Institute Medallist Drawings 1898; Harold Watts [*Probationer* 1893, *Student* 1896], Plymouth. As HON. FELLOW, The Right Honourable Sir Richard Temple, Bart., G.C.S.I., C.I.E., D.C.L., LL.D., F.R.S.

The President announced that the Council proposed to submit to Her Majesty the Queen the name of Professor the Commendatore Rodolfo Lanciani, D.C.L. Oxon. (*Hon. Corr. M. Rome*), as a fit recipient of the Royal Gold Medal 1900.

ADDRESSES TO STUDENTS having been delivered by the President and Mr. G. F. Bodley [*F.*], A.R.A., a vote of thanks was passed to the authors by acclamation.

The President distributed the Prizes and introduced the Travelling Students, in accordance with the Council's Deed of Award [*ante*, pp. 114 *seq.*], and further presented to the respective holders the medals connected with the Godwin Bursary and Pugin Studentship of 1899.

The proceedings then closed, and the Meeting separated at 10.15 p.m.

